

1937 33rd Street  
San Diego, California 92102  
March 14, 1974

David Hollenbeck  
303 N. 47th Street  
San Diego, California 92102

Dear David,

It is nothing new for you and I to differ in our politics or tactics. For that reason I don't usually take the time to respond in writing to your column. I am taking the time on this occasion because I was particularly bothered by the tone of some of your remarks in the PCT about "The Friendly Police at the Gay Center".

Because you have been more vocal (over the years) than just about any other gay person in San Diego on the subject of gay people and the police department (for which you are to be commended) I fear that your comments may be regarded as representative of the majority of the gay community, or even of the Gay Center For Social Services, particularly when read by the police or non-gay people. I think that you must be aware of that and should therefore also be aware of the effect of remarks such as you made in paragraphs one and five of your column.

Much of your column was perceptive, analytical, and right on--worthy of a man of your intelligence. The part which I mentioned were objectionable to me because they seem to indicate that your first concern was with such irrelevant matters as whether or not the spokespersons were "attractive" in a physical way or whether the "stroking" was physical or figurative. By doing so you severely reduced your own credibility and value as a commentator. Your between-the-lines message was even less attractive. For it seems to me to be saying, "I can only relate to these men via sexual fantasies". I would find such comments just as inappropriate and offensive if they were made by a man about a woman or vice versa.

The gay liberation movement began many years ago because gay people were tired of being treated and defined solely within the context of their sexuality rather than as whole persons. We were tired of people making such an issue out of sex-object choice and sexual expression. But your "cute" remarks provoke such treatment. Knowing you, I would guess that those remarks were meant to be humorous, and therefore harmless. Perhaps they would be in certain contexts. However, in this case the humor wears a bit thin. How would you feel if you were participating in the gay sensitization for police (which you proposed and which proposal I endorse) and a police evaluation of your presentation was spiced with frivolous remarks about whether or not you were attractive or capable of turning someone on sexually? Whether such an evaluation might be written by a man or a woman is irrelevant. I doubt that you would feel very much like going back to talk again. I know I wouldn't.

I am not the least bit concerned about how attractive Sgt Price or Capt. Ecklund are to you--or how disappointed you were that they were all business--or whether their "stroking" would keep you calm!! I am very much concerned about the image that police officers have of gay people because that image will determine how they react to us on the street, parks, and beaches no matter what laws are changed in Sacramento. And I believe that the irresponsible remarks



(2)

that you made in your column (whatever the motivation) will stick in their minds far longer than the responsible ones that you made.

Thoughts on paper for publication carry much more weight than if spoken by an individual. You, David, are often thought to be speaking for the entire gay community rather than just yourself. For that reason I think that you should bear a greater concern for the implications in what you write.

I have a great deal of love and respect for you, David. I think you know that. I have no desire to practice censorship, or tell you what your thoughts "ought" to be, or define liberation for you. We've talked about that before. I just felt it necessary to present you with some responsible opposition and an alternative viewpoint.

Love in the struggle,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Jess'.

Jess